

infrastructure. It is the research facilities, the sanitation, the water facilities, the highway and rail facilities.

The President has made a proposal. It is up to us to respond to that. Six years, fully paid for, no increase in the gasoline and diesel tax, it is all there. All we need to do is grab it and grab the future in the process. I am happy for the opportunity to share this evening on building tomorrow's future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAN NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting these days to hear our current Secretary of State, someone who as a Congressman went to Central America and basically was negotiating a deal with a communist leader—corrupt—at the same time the Reagan administration was conducting negotiations.

I am very proud of my Senate friends down at the other end of the Capitol who sent a letter to Iran, since the former constitutional law instructor—not professor, but instructor—from Chicago doesn't seem to realize he needs the Senate advice and consent in order to create a binding treaty with another country, especially one that actually has a major impact on the ability to continue to exist for Israel and the United States.

If this President and Secretary of State get the deal that includes everything that we would want that this administration has not already taken off the table overtly, then it means nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

Our allies in the Middle East, so-called Saudi Arabia; Qatar; UAE; Egypt; and, in fact, most of the nations in the Middle East—Jordan, perhaps—are all going to need nuclear weapons to protect themselves.

If this administration continues to persist with anything that does not require dismantling and stoppage of the spinning of the centrifuges in Iran that continue to develop nuclear material for bombs, then the whole world is going to be in trouble.

In fact, the negotiations have become so desperate on the part of our own administration that then-Congressman John Kerry would try to sit down and negotiate with a communist criminal leader in Central America and undermine the efforts of the Reagan administration.

Our friends down the hall—47 Senators—were completely aboveboard. They said nothing inappropriate. There was no crime, no treason. They were just advising people to the negotiations that here is what the U.S. Constitution says.

Apparently, they had not been so advised by our constitutional law in-

structor Commander in Chief, so it is important that somebody did, and I am pleased that my colleague and friend TOM COTTON did just that.

But here we are. I think this article from townhall.com by Katie Pavlich illustrates very clearly just how desperate this administration has gotten to get any kind of deal, just any kind of deal so they can say they got a deal.

Yes, okay, Iran has an agreement that will allow Iran to continue to cheat, as they have been found to have done a number of times, so it doesn't actually allow them to have not just a nuke in 10 years, they could covertly develop a nuke within the year if they so wished.

My friends DANA ROHRBACHER and STEVE KING met with IAEA representatives who had been inspecting Iran, and it left me extremely concerned about how quickly, easily, and covertly Iran could go ahead and move to the next step, even beyond 5 or 20 percent enrichment, as Iran has gotten.

Here is this article from Katie Pavlich from March 16. In part, she says:

According to a report in The Times of Israel, the National Intelligence Agency delivered a report to Congress that scraps Iran and Hezbollah from the terrorism list, citing the country's work against ISIS as one of the reasons why.

Mr. Speaker, if this administration is scrapping—taking—Iran and Hezbollah off the terrorist list, then the last thing we need this administration doing is negotiating with these terrorists—this terrorist regime—trying to work out a deal because anybody that would say Iran and Hezbollah are not a terrorist country and terrorist organization should not be negotiating anything for the United States of America, where the vast bulk—thank God—of the American people do not want to support, lend credence to, or in any way help terrorist countries or a terrorist organization like Hezbollah.

It goes ahead and quotes from the National Intelligence Agency report from The Times of Israel and then has Ms. Pavlich's question:

Is ISIS a threat? Absolutely. Should we align ourselves with or appease Iran because of their work against ISIS? Absolutely not.

As a reminder, Hezbollah, funded by Iran, is the largest terror organization in the world. Before 9/11, Hezbollah, not al Qaeda, was responsible for the majority of U.S. terrorism deaths, including the 1983 bombings of U.S. Marine barracks and U.S. Embassy in Beirut, in addition to a series of attacks in the 1980s.

Hezbollah is also responsible for countless attacks on Israel. In 1992, Hezbollah, with help from Iran, bombed the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires. In 1994, they bombed the Jewish community center in the same South American city.

Those are just a handful of examples that don't even account for the thousands of rockets Hezbollah has launched into Israel throughout the years.

So what's going on here? Why strip Hezbollah and its funding parent Iran from the terrorism label? Especially now? It all points back to getting President Obama his deal with Iran at all costs.

This reclassification of Iran and Hezbollah without the terrorism label is a certain warning sign the deal the White House is working on to appease the rogue regime does not have the best interests of the United States as a top priority.

Since, apparently, this administration is not aware, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues here in Congress would want to be aware of what the administration isn't. Maybe that comes from not reading the intelligence reports, but you don't even have to get an intelligence report from an intelligence agency.

This, for example, comes from the Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America, and it is a timeline for Hezbollah violence.

1982, Israel invades Lebanon to drive out the PLO's terrorist army, which had frequently attacked Israel from its informal "state within a state" in southern Lebanon.

Hezbollah, a Shiite group inspired by the teachings and revolution of Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini, is created with the assistance of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps.

The group is called Hezbollah, or "party of God" after initially taking responsibility for attacks under the name "Islamic jihad."

Some thought that was the Republican Party, but actually it is Hezbollah that is the party of God.

□ 1830

In July of 1982, the president of American University in Beirut, Davis S. Dodge, is kidnapped. Hezbollah is believed to be behind this and most of the other 30 Westerners kidnapped over the next 10 years.

April 18, 1983, Hezbollah attacks the U.S. Embassy in Beirut with a car bomb, killing 63 people, 17 of whom were American citizens.

October 23, 1983, the group attacks a U.S. Marine barracks with a truck bomb, killing 241 American military personnel stationed in Beirut as part of the peacekeeping force. A separate attack against the French military compound in Beirut kills 58.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that, to the Obama administration, the killing of all these marines, the killing of all these American citizens in Beirut, and the kidnapping of Americans and other diplomats by Hezbollah would be considered workplace violence. I get that. But to most people in America, they understand these are acts of sheer terrorism, and they need to be called what they are.

September of 1984, the group attacks the U.S. Embassy annex in Beirut with a car bomb, killing two Americans and 22 others.

More workplace violence.

March of 1984, William F. Buckley, a CIA operative working at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, is kidnapped and later murdered.

April of 1984, Hezbollah attacks a restaurant near the U.S. Air Force Base in Spain. The bombing kills 18 U.S. servicemen, injuries 83.

December of '84, Hezbollah terrorists hijack a Kuwait Airlines plane. Four passengers are murdered, including two Americans.

I don't see how this administration would be able to classify that hijacking and murders as workplace violence, but you never know.

February 1985, Hezbollah publicizes its manifesto. It notes that the group's struggle

will continue until Israel is destroyed and rejects any cease-fire or peace treaty with Israel. The document also attacks the U.S. and France.

June 1985, Hezbollah terrorists attack TWA Flight 847. The hijackers severely beat passenger Robert Stethem, a U.S. Navy diver, before killing him and dumping his body onto the tarmac at the Beirut airport. Other passengers are held hostage before being released on June 30.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that many Americans will remember these events and know how strongly we felt about the terrorism being carried out by Hezbollah, that this administration would like to call a peace-seeking organization. Yeah, it is a peace-seeking organization, just like a heat-seeking missile is a peacekeeping missile. They will blow up anything that they can get ahold of that is American.

December '86, under the alias of Organization of Oppressed on Earth, Hezbollah announces it had kidnapped and murdered three Lebanese Jews. The organization previously had taken responsibility for killing four other Jews since 1984.

February of '88, Hezbollah kidnaps Colonel William Higgins, a U.S. Marine serving with a U.N. truce-monitoring group in Lebanon, and murders him.

October of '89, members of the dissolved Lebanese Parliament ratify the Taif Agreement. Although the agreement calls for the disbanding of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias, Hezbollah remains active.

February '92, Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah takes over Hezbollah after Israel kills the group's leader, Abbas Musawi.

March of '92, with the help of Iranian intelligence, Hezbollah bombs the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, killing 29, injuring over 200.

July 1994, Hezbollah bombs the Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, again with Iranian help, killing 86 and injuring over 200.

November 1995, Hezbollah bombards towns in northern Israel with volleys of Katyusha rockets in one of the group's numerous attacks on Israeli civilians.

March '96, Hezbollah fires 28 Katyusha rockets into northern Israeli towns. A week later, the group fires 16 rockets, injuring 36 Israelis. Israel responds with a major offensive known as the "Grapes of Wrath" operation to stop Hezbollah rocket fire.

August 1997, Hezbollah opened fire on northern Israel with dozens of rockets in one of the group's numerous attacks on Israeli civilians.

October of '97, the United States lists Hezbollah as a terrorist organization.

And parenthetically, we might insert, this is October of 1997. This is the Clinton administration. This is the Clinton administration that heard cries of Muslims in other parts of the world, and it seemed that, despite the fact that the Clinton administration rushed, sent military to assist Muslims in other parts of the world, all the while, Islamic terrorists were plotting to blow up the World Trade Centers by sending planes crashing into them.

Now, it would seem, if these were peace-seeking organizations, like Hezbollah, like the Nation of Iran, the administration of that nation, at least they would take note that, gee, the Clinton administration is reaching out every way they can to help Muslims in

the world, and we should take note of that and ease up.

But that was not happening, not by a terrorist group like Hezbollah. In fact, in May of 1999, Hezbollah opens fire on northern Israel with dozens of rockets in one of the group's numerous attacks on Israeli civilians.

June of '99, Hezbollah opens fire on northern Israel, killing two.

May of 2000, Israel withdraws troops from Lebanon after 18 years of patrolling the "security zone," a strip of land in the south of the country. The security zone was set up to prevent attacks on northern Israel.

June of 2000, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan certifies Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon. Shortly thereafter, the U.N. Security Council endorses Annan's report. Hezbollah, nonetheless, alleges Israel occupies Lebanon, claiming the small Shebaa Farms area Israel captured from Syria during the 1967 war as Lebanese territory.

It seems Hezbollah was so intent on being a terrorist organization, even when Israel handed over land that it was claiming, they still were not content. They wanted terrorism; and, actually, they want Israel and the United States eliminated.

October of 2000, Hezbollah attacks Israel military posts and raids Israel, kidnapping three Israeli soldiers.

March 2001, the British Government adds Hezbollah's "military wing" to its list of outlawed terrorist organizations.

April 2002, Hezbollah launches Katyushas into northern Israeli town, and the assault comes amidst almost daily Hezbollah attacks against Israeli troops in Shebaa Farms.

December 2002, Canada lists Hezbollah as a terrorist organization.

August 2003, Hezbollah shells and kills 16-year-old Israeli boy, wounds others.

June 2003, Australia lists Hezbollah's "military wing" as a terrorist organization.

September 2004, U.N. Security Council Resolution 1559 calls for the "disbanding and disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias," a reference to Hezbollah.

December 2004, both the United States and France bans Hezbollah's satellite television network, Al-Manar. A U.S. State Department spokesman notes the channel "preaches violence and hatred."

March 2005, the European Parliament overwhelmingly passes a resolution stating: "Parliament considers that clear evidence exists of terrorist activities by Hezbollah. The European Union Council should take all necessary steps to curtail them." The European Union, nonetheless, refrains from placing the group on its list of terrorist organizations.

July of 2006, Hezbollah attacks Israel with Katyushas, crosses the border, kidnaps two Israeli soldiers. Three Israeli soldiers are killed in the initial attack. Five more soldiers are killed as Israel launches an operation to rescue the soldiers and push Hezbollah from its border. And during the ensuing war, Hezbollah launches rockets at civilian targets.

August 2006, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopts Resolution 1701, which calls for a cessation of hostilities, the deployment of Lebanese and U.N. forces into southern Lebanon, and the disarmament of armed groups in Lebanon.

So anybody in this administration here in the U.S. or elsewhere who thinks that Hezbollah is not a terrorist organization then clearly thinks that

every place that Hezbollah has killed innocent people is just another workplace where violence occurred, a random act of violence or violence in the workplace, because it is insane to think that Iran is not a sponsor of terrorism, that Iran has not killed more Americans than any other country in the last 15 years. It is incredible. That is outside of 9/11, the killing of approximately 3,000 Americans on 9/11 between the Pentagon and New York City.

But as far as American servicemembers fighting in Iraq, it was Iran who was behind the killing of most of those American servicemembers. Iran has fought vehemently to eliminate the United States' presence from Iraq.

I think if we could get to the bottom of why there was not a status of forces agreement, you would find that it is because the Ayatollah Khomeini, Ahmadinejad, President at the time, said they believed that the twelfth imam, the Mahdi, would come, would arise back to power, would come to power amidst chaos.

As I understand their beliefs and their beliefs in prophecy, he would first come to reign from the town of Kufa, which the way the lines were drawn in the 20th century put Kufa in Iraq.

Unfortunately, the State Department, the Justice Department, the intelligence agencies under the Obama administration have had their training materials regarding the beliefs of radical Islamists purged, so they are not allowed to learn exactly what our enemy believes and what they have believed, and so it is hard for them to anticipate what our enemies want to do. And perhaps all the purging has helped lead this administration to the idea that if we purge all the educational material about what radical Islamists believe, then maybe it won't be actual and factual.

□ 1845

Yet the New York Post says: "ISIS Accepts Boko Haram's Pledge of Allegiance."

We had an article in the last recent weeks where a Catholic bishop from Nigeria had indicated that the Obama administration basically was indicating that if Nigeria did not amend their marriage laws to go against the laws of nature and nature's god, as Christians believe and as the Bible teaches, then the Obama administration would not help them at all against the terrorist activities of Boko Haram.

I don't know what kind of blindness it takes or prejudice it takes to see the suffering in Africa, in a place like Nigeria, and hold the hands and weep with the parents of daughters who were kidnapped by Boko Haram, and understand the suffering being brought against Christians for their beliefs, these Christian girls that Boko Haram has kidnapped, forced into sexual slavery—what kind of callousness does it take to see that suffering and say, Oh, no, if you don't go against your religious beliefs in marriage between a

man and a woman, we are not going to help you, and we are going to let Boko Haram continue to terrorize you and rape your women.

You talk about a war against women.

When I asked these mothers of the girls that were kidnapped there, Did they initially attack your daughters' school because it was a girls' school? they said, No, no. They hate girls. They consider them nothing. But they attacked the school because it is Christian.

There is a report from Investor's Business Daily, March 13, that says Islamic State recruits could enter the United States via the Caribbean. Well, that is not really a news flash.

Another story, written by Thomas D. Williams, Ph.D., March 17: "ISIS Kidnaps 20 Doctors and Nurses in Libya."

A story from Charles Spiering, 17 March: "President Obama Blames Bush for Rise of ISIS."

Well, actually, if you want to talk about class, despite my disagreement with some of George W. Bush's policies and despite what some have said, he had enough class that after 9/11 he never pointed the finger at the Clinton administration. He knew that even though 9/11 was being plotted and planned during the Clinton administration and there was an opportunity in the Clinton administration to take out Osama bin Laden that was not seized upon, that there were so many things that might have been stopped along the way, he didn't blame President Clinton because he had enough class to know that it was an attack by terrorists, and they should be made to pay.

If you really want to point the finger, it would go clear back to the late seventies during the days I was in the United States Army and we had what was considered, under most everybody's version of international law, an act of war against the United States in Iran when our Embassy was attacked and our people were taken hostage. And we didn't help.

You go back before that, to the Carter administration turning its back upon the shah of Iran—not a great guy, not a good man, from what we understand, but he was able to keep radical Islam contained. But after the Carter administration turned its back on the shah and encouraged his overthrow, you had the coming from exile of Ayatollah Khomeini, and President Carter welcomed him as a man of peace. As a result, radical Islam, once again, raised its ugly head, as it does from time to time.

And it is only all-out war against radical Islam that puts it in a box—sometimes for 50 years, sometimes for 100 years. It depends on how staunch the fight is against them.

But President Bush did not blame President Carter. There were mistakes all along the way.

When the marine barracks in Beirut was hit, the Democrat-controlled Congress made clear that they were not going to fund any more U.S. peace-

keeping troops in Beirut. Reagan brought them home. He should have taken them out and done whatever it took, but he didn't.

Now this administration, in order to get any deal that is a terrible deal, is willing to turn its back on the fact that Iran and Hezbollah have terrorists in their lead, and they should not be recognized as anything but terrorists.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FAST-TRACKING THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we are going to use these 30 minutes to speak to fast track and a process on trade agreements that are developed. I believe it is so important for the American public to understand exactly what fast track is all about.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Tonight we are here to discuss, as I indicated, Trade Promotion Authority, most commonly known as fast track. Free trade agreements that would be accompanied by a fast-track process are a way to bring about devastating outcomes, if not done correctly, to the American economy and, most importantly, to the American worker.

Of late, most notably, the free trade agreement of which there is much concern expressed is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the TPP, which, by the way, would speak to a great number of nations which encompass about 40 percent of the international GDP. So it is no small compact here of which we speak.

Fast track, as a concept, would constrain Congress' ability to conduct oversight, restrain oversight that Congress should provide so as to be the voice of the people who elect them, to place their given concerns in the discussions here in the House.

It would delegate Congress' constitutional authority over trade policy in a way that would provide for no solid debate, no sharply restricting debate, and it would prohibit amendments. Basically, Congress would be limited to a simple up-or-down vote—thumbs up, thumbs down—on what could be a devastating outcome for the American economy and, most importantly, the American worker.

These so-called free trade agreements have far-reaching impacts on American life. They may address dynamics like

food safety or affordable medicine or financial regulations. So we cannot be reckless in our attempt, and we must make certain that we move forward deliberately to make certain that it is a good outcome for trade.

We are not against trade. Free trade, as it has been described in the past and agreed to in the past, has hurt the economy, but we want fair trade.

In exchange for fast-tracking bills, Congress is supposed to set these negotiating objectives. But let's face it: sadly, these objectives are nonbinding, so they could be rendered meaningless. And in the case of the TPP, which is nearly completed, setting them at this point is somewhat late in the process.

We know also that the TPP is going to model itself after NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement that dealt with Canada and Mexico, and also the Korean agreement. And the bottom line is, those deals have not been good for the American middle class, for working families.

Certainly we would be giving up a golden opportunity to exercise our responsibilities here in Congress to make certain it is the best outcome for America.

Promises of new jobs here in the U.S. are one of those promises for which we take great concern.

Decreased trade deficits—it can be said that trade deficits have provided the greatest dent in the American economy. There are huge deficits that have staggered the efforts to grow American jobs and improve labor and environmental standards. These are promises that have failed: jobs to be produced, environmental standards and labor standards never really come to be. Even if they are written on paper with the enforcement requirements, they have not reached their potential. And certainly the job count is not what it should be.

As we lost manufacturing jobs, millions of manufacturing jobs, one in every four manufacturing jobs, it was a devastating outcome. Three of every five American workers who lost those manufacturing jobs ended up with pay cuts, and one of three of those in the three-out-of-five category ended up with more than 20 percent of a paycheck reduction.

This is not what we want in the order of progressive policies that will speak to a stronger economy. So I have grave concern for the fast-track process.

Those joining us tonight and those like the gentlewoman from New York, Representative SLAUGHTER, who will share her thoughts in writing, which will be incorporated in the annals of these proceedings, for this Special Order, these are Members who are very concerned.

And chief amongst them, the one who has led us in this effort to draw public awareness and political attention to this issue, is none other than Representative ROSA DELAUNO, our colleague from Connecticut, who has done a solid job in bringing to everyone's